DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 913 CS 007 185

AUTHOR Sauder, Ruth
TITLE Comparison of Literacy Campaigns in Socialistic and Democratic Countries.
PUB DATE Dec 82
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; *Democracy; Government Role; *Literacy; *Literacy Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Socialism; Success

ABSTRACT

The literature on mass literacy campaigns conducted in various countries over the past several decades was surveyed to determine if efforts in socialist countries were more successful than those in democratic countries. Five socialist and five democratic countries were matched on the basis of population, geographic proximity, or size. The pairs are Russia-Brazil, China-India, Nicaragua-Guatemala, Tanzania-Ecuador, and Cuba-Venezuela. A four-level standard of success was devised for the study: Level I--the completion of basic literacy skills; Level II--the completion of postliteracy courses; Level III--the achievement of at least four of the literacy goals cited by the countries in their overall objectives, including better production, more social justice, and greater participation in political and community affairs; and Level IV--the reduction of illiteracy rates on a national level. Results showed that (1) Russia's, Tanzania's and Brazil's campaigns were successful on all four levels; (2) Nicaragua's, China's and Cuba's campaigns were successful on Levels I, III, and IV; (3) India's campaign was successful on Levels I, II, and III; (4) Guatemala's campaign was successful on Levels I and II: and (5) Ecuador's was successful on Level I only. Venezuela's campaign was eliminated because of incomplete data. The results indicate that literacy campaigns were more successful in socialist than in democratic countries. (Extensive tables of data are appended.) (FL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED230913

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# Comparison of Literacy Campaigns in Socialistic and Democratic Countries

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ruth Sauder
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Ruth Sauder

A paper submitted for partial requirement for graduate work in the course X750, Reading in Out-of-School Settings, taught by Dr. Larry Mikulecky at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, December, 1982

CS 007 185

Comparison of Literacy Campaigns in
Socialistic and Democratic Countries

## Summary Paragraph

This study is an examination of the literature on mass literacy campaigns that have been conducted in the last several decades. It is perceived that the campaigns in socialistic countries are more successful than campaigns in democratic countries. A standard of success was established for the study. Ten countries were chosen, five with socialistic governments, and five with democratic governments. They represent roughly similar pairs of countries based on population, size, or geographical proximity. They include: Russia - Brazil, China - India, Nicaragua - Guatemala, Tanzania - Ecuador, and Cuba - Venezuela.

Data are graphically presented through a series of tables following the text. After analysis of the data, it was found that literacy campaigns are indeed more successful in socialistic countries than in democratic countries according to the standard of success established for the study.

# Comparison of Literacy Campaigns in Socialistic and Democratic Countries

Many developing countries are realizing that in the process of national development, adult basic literacy is of vital importance for over-all development. H. S. Bhola states,

> The poor and the exploited the world over are illiterate as well. The world map of poverty is also the world map of illiteracy. Within nations, the illiterate are the most desperately poor. They are the hungry, sick, abused, and powerless. Fortunately development planners are now beginning to see illiteracy as the bottleneck to development.[1]

Work has been done in betterment of the formal school systems which has an effect on the country's literacy rate, but very slight gains are made annually working through formal schooling. Even if all school-age children were attending school at the present, it would be a generation before any significant change would be registered. Most countries are looking for faster development than this and realize that something needs to be done with adult basic literacy. Adults constitute the segment of the population that is now contributing to the national

productivity in development, and literate adults can contribute more meaningfully than the illiterate. This is true economically, socially, politically, and spiritually.

Many countries have appointed organizations separate from, or jointly operating with, the Ministry of Education, especially for adult education programs. National budgets include an allottment for such programs. In some cases, the programs have been struggling efforts with mediocre support of the administrations, or the plans may be drawn up that appear comprehensive enough to involve the whole nation, but mobilization of the people is difficult, or the funds never filter down through the administrative channels to where they are needed most - on the local level for materials. Classes may be started in rural areas, but after a month or two, interest lags and attendance dwindles until the whole effort is phased out.

Because of these kinds of problems, and because of the reports from other countries of successful mass literacy campaigns, many countries are opting for the mass approach. This approach involves much more than making people literate. It can be used to mobilize whole nations for politicization and development. The functional literacy approach can be used to increase production in industry, agriculture, and business. It can unite the people of a nation culturally, linguistically, politically, and socially, and offers equal opportunity for learning to everyone.[2]

Authors of many articles on literacy perceive that literacy campaigns in socialistic countries are more successful than those conducted in democratic countries. The present study

was done to try to determine on what bases they are perceived as being more successful and if, in fact, they are.

Two hypotheses were used for the study:

1. Though it is perceived that literacy campaigns are more successful in socialistic countries than in democratic countries, objective data will reveal few differences.
2. Literacy campaigns are successful in terms of basic literacy, post literacy, and quality of life improvement when they meet the following criteria:
   a. The highest powers of the country initiate and/or strongly support the campaign.
   b. The goal is to reach all illiterates and bring about other developmental changes for the masses.
   c. A large part of the population, both individual and organizational, is involved in the campaign.
   d. The length of the campaign is sufficient to produce literates reading at a certain grade level.
   e. Illiteracy rates are reduced by a certain percent, or a certain percent of the target group is made literate if a pilot project.

The following four-level standard will be used for a definition of success:

Level I

Completion of basic literacy skills, recognition, understanding, and ability to read material in primers up to the beginning first-grade level. Writing skills are basically copying. Mastery of mental math with one-digit numbers in addition and subtraction.

Level II

Completion of post literacy courses with ability to read at least third-grade level materials, do math computation in the four operations with two-digit numbers, and ability to write a complete idea that makes sense.

Level III

Achievement of at least four of the following non-literacy goals that most countries include in over-all objectives:

a. better production
b. higher standard of living
c. better nutrition and health
d. better job opportunities
e. social justice
f. greater participation in local and national political and community affairs
g. others as listed on Table II

Level IV

Illiteracy rates on the national level were reduced by at least twenty percent, or sixty-six percent of the target group became literate if a pilot project.

For this study, five countries were chosen with Marxist or socialistic governments, and five countries with more democratic or capitalistic governments. The definition used to determine a socialistic country is as follows:

> Any country that has had social and political movements advocating collective or governmental ownership and administration of the means of production and control of the distribution of goods.

The ten countries represent roughly similar pairs of countries based on population, size, or geographical proximity. They include: Russia - Brazil, China - India, Nicaragua - Guatemala, Tanzania - Ecuador, Cuba - Venezuela.

Each of these countries has had a major literacy campaign within the past twenty-five year period (most more recently than that) except Russia, who had pioneered the mass literacy movement from 1919 to 1939, shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.[3]

India's and Ecuador's campaigns were pilot projects in functional literacy, not nation-wide thrusts as were the other eight, but can be compared for the target areas chosen for the project.

Using the above criteria, the results should show the degree of success of mass literacy campaigns in each of these countries. After comparing this information, one could possibly predict outcomes of planned campaigns, and if involved in the planning or actuation of a campaign, one could choose the methods that are most certain to produce the desired results, avoiding the problem areas that were detrimental to the success

of the campaigns in this study.

For comparison purposes and for greater clarity, the nature of the campaigns of each of the countries will be presented by a series of tables. Table I on page 21 of this paper shows the initiators of the campaigns in each country. In 40 percent of the countries, all socialistic in character, a strong political figure was the driving force behind the campaign. In Russia it was Lenin. In Tanzania, it is Nyerere, in China, Mao Tse Tung, and in Cuba, Castro.

In 30 percent of the countries, the Ministry of Education or a special adult literacy organization received the support of the government in sponsoring the campaigns. These were Brazil, Guatemala, and Venezuela.[4]

In Nicaragua, the government was the instigating force. In India and Ecuador, the campaign idea came from an outside organization, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in combination with UNESCO in a special project called the Experimental World Literacy Programme (EWLP).[5]

Table II on page 22 shows the goals or objectives for the campaigns. These were condensed into thirteen items most commonly mentioned. The ones checked for each country were those stated in the literature and a few were implied. Some that were not checked, were longer-range goals beyond the time set for the campaign being studied in this paper. Since many of the countries have continuing adult education programs, these <u>are</u> goals, but only for the next phases.

All the countries have mastery of the 3R's as one of the main goals, but Cuba's one-year campaign did not stress writing as one of the primary aims. The criteria for proclaiming some-

one literate after the first year was solely his/her ability to read the lessons of the primer.

The goals for Guatemala's 1981 campaign were taken from the Ministry of Education's National Education Policy of 1979-1983 [6] and my own knowledge and experience of being there during the time. An additional objective which does not appear on the table, is the concern for making education more available and conformable to the needs of the rural population and the marginal urban population.

India's chief goal for the pilot project in functional literacy was to increase food production using improved seeds, fertilizers, and better methods including double and triple-cropping a year where possible.[7]

Brazil and Ecuador are the only countries for which I found the stated objective "better job opportunities", but it is implied by some of the other objectives in most countries.

I feel this table does not present a complete picture, as the official list of objectives for each country was not available, and the different times set for the campaigns varied greatly from one year to twenty years or more. Objectives for a one-year campaign cannot realistically be the same as for an extended period of time. The major ones, however, lettered A and B on the chart, e.g., eradication of illiteracy and learning the 3R's, are the ones we should examine most closely for this study.

Tanzania has a goal of eradication of illiteracy[8] but it was an unreasonable goal for the time period designated

for the campaign considered here.

That leaves India, Ecuador, and Guatemala who have not specified as a goal, (in the material concerning these campaigns) literacy for everyone. There are indications elsewhere that this is a part of the long-range plans of all, at least all the member states of UNESCO.[9]

Table III on page 23 shows the target groups to be made literate in each country. In 70 percent of the campaigns, the target group is the total illiterate population. India's and Ecuador's were pilot projects in functional literacy mainly to increase production in connection with literacy training, with the possibility of expanding to other areas in the country if the pilot project was successful.

Guatemala has not yet joined forces in the country to attack illiteracy on all fronts. In the planning schemes, this is a long-range goal, but at present they have a combined strategy for working at illiteracy problems.[10] They first begin with the high-potential areas or priority groups. These are the illiterates who are easiest to reach - those in urban and small-town settings, or rural areas where elementary schools already exist. A much more unified effort and a more decentralized administration needs to be created before the program can become strongly effective. There are too many influential people in the rural areas where literacy rates are lowest who benefit more by having the illiterate work force than they would if they contributed time and money to educate these people, thus creating tensions over low wages and/or loss of laborers.[11] At present, any literacy campaign is not going to have much

support from that segment of the population who could be of most help.

This table also shows the percentages of the populations that were illiterate at the outset of the campaigns, the ages represented in that percentage, and the approximate number of people to be reached. The average percentage of illiterates in the total population of these countries was 47.7 percent, excluding India. The range was from a low of 23.6 percent in Cuba, to 85 percent in China. The age level included in the percentage of illiterates ranged from 8 on up, but most countries included 15-year-olds and up as adults. Several designated a cut-off limit of 40, 45, or 50-year-olds.

The total number of people included in the target population was nearly 300,000,000 in the ten countries.

On Table IV on page 24 , the dates for the campaigns being studied are given. Russia conducted the forerunner of mass literacy campaigns from 1919 to 1939. (See page 5) Venezuela's campaign continues at the present time and will officially end in 1983.

The number of years for each campaign are also given here, and at least 90 percent of the countries are continuing adult literacy programs including basic literacy, post literacy, and primary or functional studies for adults.

India's functional approach to literacy has been extended to other areas. Russia has already attained its goal of eradication of illiteracy. Each year the DAEA ( The adult education organization) in Guatemala constructs a national plan for adult literacy. This plan may have several stages - one

to deal with basic literacy, another post literacy.[12] They may also have a Spanish phase and an indigenous languages phase as they did in 1981.[13] Guatemala has enough internal strife with the unsettled political situation and war between the leftest guerrillas and the Rios Montt government that the possibility of any extensive work being done outside the formal school setting is doubtful at the present time. In fact, the 1981 campaign was phased out due to the tension and danger in rural areas.

Table V on page 25 shows the type and source of financial aid given for the campaigns. In all the countries, the government was at least partly responsible for the administrative costs except in Venezuela. In 70 percent, the teachers received some financial remuneration for their services from the government. Businesses or other organizations supported teachers in 50 percent of the countries. Teacher-trainers were also paid by government funds in 80 percent of the countries. The government took responsibility for funding materials in 80 percent of the countries.

Volunteers were used to teach in 90 percent of the countries and most of these taught without remuneration. China's program was more mass-supported financially than any of the other campaigns, while Brazil's was almost totally government supported.

Table VI is an eight-page table showing the personnel and organizations involved in the campaigns. The first two sections, VI-A and VI-B on pages 26-27 , present all ten of the countries showing the organizations involved in admin-

istration and publicity for the campaigns. (The numbers for end notes on these two pages include all the information found on all eight pages of Table VI)

In 90 percent of the campaigns, the Ministry of Education was the highest branch of administration. In the early stages of the Russian campaign, Lenin's wife, Nadezhda Konstantinova Krupskaya, headed up the campaign with the help of the Commisariat of Education and the Party.[14]

Only in Venezuela are the official education departments not responsible for the campaign. ACUDE is an organization made up of the private sector, and this organization is conducting the campaign.[15]

Mass media was used for publicity in all the countries where the campaign covered the whole illiterate population. In India and Ecuador, where the campaigns were pilot projects, mass media may have been used, but the information was directed only to the target areas. This publicity was the responsibility of the national or district administration.

Tables VI-C and VI-D on pages 28 - 29 present teacher-training staff and organizations who did the teaching in each campaign. In every campaign, the professional teachers were key figures in the teaching corps, and in training volunteer teachers in many countries. In Venezuela, many of the community leaders were volunteers from the educational field.

Volunteer teachers such as students, literate workers (professional, office, and factory), or housewives were used in 80 percent of the campaigns. Ecuador and India, the two countries with the functional literacy projects, used only

professionally-trained teachers and technicians in the area of special training.

Tables VI-E and VI-F on pages 30 - 31 list the supervisors of the teachers, or in some cases, those who served in a counsellor role for volunteers. Also shown is a list of the committees, organizations, or individuals who were responsible for production of materials - primers, follow-up readers, and teacher-training materials or aids for teachers.

Here again the professional teachers were utilized, 50 percent of the countries using them in supervisory roles. In at least three of the countries, specially-trained educational supervisors were used. Venezuela's community leaders could be professional teachers, but this is not specified. The producers of materials are almost as varied as the number of countries.

The last two pages of Table VI, G and H, on pages 32 and 33 , show who was responsible for evaluation, either evaluation of the progress of individual students or over-all evaluation of the campaign. The second column has a list of the organizations who promoted the campaigns in many ways. Businesses and factories enccuraged and provided a way for their illiterate employees to study. Army training programs included literacy courses. Some groups provided funds for materials, others supplied teachers. This list shows the involvement of large segments of the society in almost all of the countries.

Table VII is a three-page presentation of criteria used in each country whereby a student was declared literate. For some of the countries, the grade level is clearly stated, e.g.,

Nicaragua and Cuba. For others, the level of math competency was used as a guide to estimate the grade level, e.g., Brazil, Russia, and Tanzania. Knowing nothing of non-phonetic alphabets, it is difficult to determine the grade-level status of China's new literates, but for this study it was figured on the basis of the number of characters a well-educated Chinese person would know, the number used in newspapers, and the number required for a person to be considered literate. Using percentages, the grade level was estimated to be at least first, but less than third-grade level, the two success-level determiners for this study.

In Table VIII on pages 37 and 38, the results have been summarized. Where possible, the percentage change in illiteracy rates is given from before and after the campaign. Russia had a 57.4 percent change in a twenty-year time span of the official campaign. Brazil had a 23.6 percent change in a ten-year period. Nicaragua reported an amazing 35.2 percent drop in illiteracy in a one-year period, but checking literacy levels when students were declared literate will contribute to this high percentage.

During Tanzania's nine-year campaign, the illiteracy rate dropped 57 to 62 percent depending on the actual percentage at the end of 1981. (Not available) They predicted that the illiteracy rate would drop to 5 to 10 percent by that date, which accounts for the variable. China had a drop of approximately 20 percent in the eight-year campaign. India's change in percentage in illiteracy was not a major concern in the five-year pilot project, and Guatemala's rate had no signifi-

cant change due to the phasing out of the program before the end of the year. Cuba had a drop of 19.7 percent in a one-year period.

In Ecuador, illiteracy rates are not available for the exact years of the campaign (1968-1972). They are given for the period 1969 (30.3 percent) to 1974 ( 26 percent) or a drop of 4.3 percent. This drop was certainly due largely to the campaign.

Venezuela's campaign is still in progress. No results can be given for their campaign except to note that the evaluation was postponed from the first scheduled date to 1983 due to serious difficulties that developed in the administration of ACUDE (see Table VIII-B).

An analysis of the data based on the four levels of success established for the study is shown in chart form on page 39.

Summarizing the same data, these are the results:

1. Russia's campaign was successful on all four levels.
2. Brazil's campaign also was successful on all four levels.
3. Nicaragua's was successful on Level I, III, and IV.
4. Guatemala's was successful on Levels I and II.
5. Tanzania's was successful on all four levels.
6. Ecuador's was successful only on Level I.
7. China's was successful on Levels I, III, and IV.
8. India's was successful on Levels I, II, and III.
9. Cuba's was successful on Levels I, III, and IV.
10. Venezuela was not included since the campaign is still in progress.

Attributing to each level of success the same value of one, the campaigns in socialistic countries were 85 percent successful, and the democratic countries were 63 percent successful, excluding Venezuela.

When a point value system of one-three-two-four is attributed to the Levels I-II-III-IV, giving more value to those levels that would seem more important, the socialistic countries' campaigns were 82 percent successful, and the democratic countries' campaigns were 53 percent successful.

When a value system of one-two-three-four is assigned to the Levels I-II-III-IV, the socialistic campaigns were 88 percent successful and the democratic campaigns were 50 percent successful.

All campaigns were successful on Level I. On Level II, the socialistic countries were 40 percent successful, and the democratic campaigns were 75 percent successful. On Level III, the socialistic campaigns were 100 percent successful, and the democratic campaigns were 50 percent successful. On Level IV, the socialistic campaigns were 100 percent successful, and the democratic ones were only 25 percent successful.

We will now consider the data from the campaigns using the criteria from the second hypothesis. This information is shown in tabular form on page 40. An "X" signifies success on that point of the criteria.

I will attribute to letter "d" of Hypothesis II the Level II standard of success for this analysis, and to the letter "e", the Level IV standard of success.

By this standard, Russia's campaign was successful on all points, as was Brazil's and Tanzania's. Nicaragua's, Chi-

na's and Cuba's were successful on four of the five points. The level of literacy was not up to at least third-grade at the end of their campaigns. Guatemala was successful on three of the five points, not having all illiterates as a target group and not reaching the 20 percent change level in the illiteracy rate during the campaign.

India's campaign was successful on two points of the hypothesis. It was supported by the government and was extended long enough to produce functional literates at third grade level or more. Ecuador's campaign was successful on one point - the support of the government for the campaign.

By these standards, the socialistic campaigns were 88 percent successful, and the democratic campaigns were 55 percent successful. (The same point value was given to each of the items in the hypothesis and Venezuela was not included in the percentages.)

Results of the study show that the first hypothesis can be supported on the Level I standard of success. It cannot be supported for Level II, since the democratic campaigns were more successful on this level. Neither can it be supported on Level III standards, for the success rate for socialistic campaigns was double that of the democratic campaigns. And on Level IV, the first hypothesis cannot be supported either, for again the socialistic campaigns were much more successful than the democratic campaigns.

The campaigns in socialistic countries are indeed more successful than the campaigns in democratic countries according to the definitions of success established for this study.

This study does not measure the control of the socialistic governments in the mobilization of their citizens and their nations in the campaign effort, nor the effects of control on the desire to study of the illiterate populations. Neither does it measure the freedom of choice on the part of those illiterate citizens in democratic countries and the effect this had on the results of the study. Neither does the study compare many of the variables that could be used to measure success. Socio-economic variables could have been used. Climatic factors could have been considered, as well as others. But those are for another study.

It would seem that more mass literacy campaigns have been conducted in socialistic countries than in democratic ones, possioly because of the political tool such a campaign can be. One of the difficulties of the study was finding enough democratic countries that had had mass campaigns. Two of these did not have total-country campaigns which had its effect on the results of the study using the success definitions established.

Another country, Venezuela, was not included in the comparison of data for the percentages arrived at to determine the degree of success, for their campaign is still in progress. Results may be changed to some degree when the evaluation has been completed and those results can be analyzed with the data from the democratic countries of the study. Predictions are difficult to make concerning Venezuela's success, for the serious problems that necessitated a complete turnover of top-level personnel in the ACUDE administration is not a favorable sign. This only tends to strengthen our findings that campaigns

are more successful in socialistic countries than in democratic countries. The administration seems to be a great contributing factor.

## Notes

[1]H. S. Bhola, Campaigning for Literacy (Paris: UNESCO Press, 1982), p. 6.

[2]Bhola, pp. 77-79.

[3]Bhola, pp. 57-58.

[4]ACUDE is an organization made up of the private sector of Venezuela and not a government organization.

[5]The Experimental World Literacy Programme: A Critical Assessment (Paris: UNESCO Press, 1976), pp. 10-13.

[6]John R. Hansen, et al., Guatemala: Economic and Social Position and Prospects (Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1978), p. 17.

[7]Experimental, p. 48.

[8]Area Handbook Series: Tanzania, A Country Study (Washington, D.C.: The American University Press, 1978), p. 179.

[9]The Udaipur Literacy Declaration (Udaipur, India: Conference for National Literacy Programs, January 11, 1982.)

[10]Estudio de la Situación en Cuanto a la Alfabetización en America Latina: Informe (Mexico: CREFAL Publications, 1968), p. 25.

[11]The large farm (finca) owners usually live in the capital city or other large city and visit their fincas rather infrequently.

[12]Estudio, p. 116.

[13]Ruth Sauder, "Human Resource Development as a Strategy for Modernization in Guatemala: Adult Literacy Emphasis", an unpublished paper. (August, 1982), p. 12.

[14]Bhola, p. 58.

[15]Asociación Cultural Para el Desarrollo: ACUDE (New York: Simón Bolivar Foundation, Inc., 1980), p. 6.

**TABLE I**

Initiators of Campaigns

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Russia[1] | Lenin | The Revolution | |
| Brazil[2] | | Government backed | MOBRAL[3] |
| Nicaragua[4] | | Government of National Reconstruction | |
| Guatemala[5] | | Some Government Support | Ministry of Education |
| Tanzania[6] | Nyerere | | |
| Ecuador[7] | | Government | EWLP[8] by request of government |
| China[9] | Mao Tse Tung | The Revolution | |
| India[10] | | Government | EWLP |
| Cuba[11] | Castro | The Revolution | |
| Venezuela[12] | | Ratified by President | ACUDE[13] |
| | Strong Political Figure | Government | Other Organization |

**TABLE II**

Objectives for the Campaigns[+]

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Russia[1] | X | X | X | | | | | X | | X | X | X | X |
| Brazil[2] | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Nicaragua[3] | X | X | | | X | | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| Guatemala[4] | | X | X | X | X | | X | | X | | | X | |
| Tanzania[5] | | X | X | X | X | | | X | | X | X | X | X |
| Ecuador[6] | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | | X | |
| China[7] | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| India[8] | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Cuba[9] | X | | X | | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Venezuela[10] | X | X | X | X | | | | X | | | X | X | |

A. Eradication of illiteracy

B. Learning the 3R's

C. Improve production

D. Raise standard of living

E. Improve nutrition and health

F. Better job opportunities

G. Social justice

H. Participation in local and national political and social affairs

I. Promoting traditional culture

J. Politicization

K. Consciousness raising

L. Modernization

M. Abolish class structures

[+]The letters checked represent primary goals. Some are implied and some are not checked that are definitely secondary goals that extend beyond the time designated for the actual campaign period. Many countries had follow-up programs.

**TABLE III**

Target Group to Be Made Literate

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Russia[1] | 70% | 8 to 50 | 70,000,000 | All illiterates |
| Brazil[2] | 33.6% | 15 and up | 18,100,000 | All illiterates |
| Nicaragua[3] | 50.2% | 10 and up | 712,616 | All illiterates |
| Guatemala[4] | 53% | 15 and up | 1,800,000 | Priority groups, Mass-progressive strategy |
| Tanzania[5] | 67% | 10 and up | 5,200,000 | All illiterates |
| Ecuador[6] | About 32% | 15 to 45 | 32,900 lowered to 15,200 later | 3 pilot areas Cuenca, Milagro, and Posillo |
| China[7] | 85% | 18 to 40 | 200,000,000 | All illiterates |
| India[8] | Not given, pilot project | 14 and up | 300,000 | 100 districts with 5 million farm families |
| Cuba[9] | 23.6% | 10 and up | 985,000 | All illiterates |
| Venezuela[10] | 16%, 37% functionally illiterate | 15 and up | 1,200,000 | All illiterates |
| | Percent of Population | Age level Included | Number of People | Pilot group or All illiterates |

TABLE IV

Length of Time for the Campaigns

| | Dates | Number of Years | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Russia[1] | 1919-1939 | 8 | Extended to 20 years |
| Brazil[2] | 1970-1980 | 10 | Is continuing |
| Nicaragua[3] | 1980 | 1 | Other phases continuing |
| Guatemala[4] | 1981 | 1 | Annual phases are conducted with differing amounts of emphasis in different years |
| Tanzania[5] | 1971-1980 | 9 | Extended to the present |
| Ecuador[6] | 1968-1972 | 5 | Pilot project, but other education continuing |
| China[7] | 1950-1958 | 8 | Extended to the present |
| India[8] | 1969-1974 | 5 | Experimental pilot program that is continuing in other areas |
| Cuba[9] | 1961 | 1 | Other levels continuing |
| Venezuela[10] | 1980-1983 | 3 | Still in progress |
| | | 24 | |

## TABLE V

How Campaigns Were Financed

| | Administration Costs | Teachers | Trainers | Materials | Transportation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Russia[1] | A | ABFG | AF | ADG | D |
| Brazil[2] | ACG+ | A | A | A | A |
| Nicaragua[3] | AGH | F | AF | ABDG | AD |
| Guatemala[4] | AG | ACFG | A | ACG | D |
| Tanzania[5] | AG | AF | AG | AG | A |
| Ecuador[6] | AH | AF | A | AG | Not given |
| China[7] | ABGH | BCF | F | DFG | D |
| India[8] | AG | A | AG | A | Not given |
| Cuba[9] | A | ACF | AF | A | A |
| Venezuela[10] | G[11] | FG | GH | DG | D |

A. Government (National and local)
B. Trade Unions
C. Businesses
D. Individuals
E. Collective Farms
F. Volunteers
G. Other
H. Communities

+MOBRAL received 6.75% of gross billings of Sports Lottery.[12]

TABLE VI-A

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | Director/Administrative Organizations | Publicity |
|---|---|---|
| Russia[1] | Lenin's wife, Nadezhda Konstantinova Krupskaya<br>Commisariat of Education under direction of the Party with departments on all levels, national to local | Government propaganda (high pressure campaign)<br>Addresses by Lenin<br>Use of all media for mobilization of the masses<br>People telling people |
| Brazil[2] | MOBRAL (Brazilian Literacy Movement)<br>Central, regional, and municipal administrators | MOBRAL used all possible media<br>Addresses by MOBRAL officials |
| Nicaragua[3] | Ministry of Education with backing of the Government of National Reconstruction<br>National Coordinating Commission | Government and National Coordinating Commission using mass media |
| Guatemala[4] | Ministry of Education (but highly centralized and weak)[5]<br>DAEA[6]<br>Other administrators on national, regional, departmental, but not local levels | Ministry of Education uses radio, TV, and newspapers<br>Local areas informed<br>through political, religious, or work-related organizations |
| Tanzania[7] | Ministry of National Education<br>Adult Education Department<br>Other administrators at each level | Presidential addresses<br>Government uses mass media<br>Positive results from pilot project sponsored by UNDP/UNESCO |

**TABLE VI-B**

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | Administrative Organizations | Publicity |
|---|---|---|
| Ecuador[8] | Ministry of Education<br>Department of Adult Education<br>National Coordinator and Committee | The National Coordinator and his Committee were responsible |
| China[9] | Ministry of Education<br>Party and governmental workers<br>Army and Trade Unions | Government agencies used all kinds of media<br>Mobilization of the people by the people |
| India[10] | Ministry of Education<br>Ministry of Agriculture<br>Information and Broadcasting Officials<br>Administrators from national to local levels | District personnel responsible for informing people and implementing classes |
| Cuba[11] | Ministry of Education<br>National Literacy Commission<br>Administrators at all levels | Strong propaganda effort by government using all media possible<br>Mobilization of the masses by the masses<br>Closing of schools |
| Venezuela[12] | ACUDE and community leaders | ACUDE through mass media |

TABLE VI-C

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | Teacher Trainers | Teachers |
|---|---|---|
| Russia | Departments of Public Education<br>School Teachers<br>Special instruction centers under Commission of Education | All school teachers<br>Literate volunteers from work and youth organizations<br>Students from the schools<br>Literates teach illiterates |
| Brazil | MOBRAL trained pedagogical and technical agents and personnel at municipal level<br>Use of radio broadcasts<br>(100,000 trained this way) | Professional teachers<br>Use of radio and TV classes with local monitors<br>Semi-volunteer teachers, some with only 4th or 5th grade education |
| Nicaragua | Teachers and students in universities in the education field (7-day initial training, in-service training, and radio program twice a day plus a series of bulletins | Literate volunteers 65,000, mostly high school students for the rural areas<br>Housewives, professionals, factory and office workers<br>225,000 total volunteers |
| Guatemala | Teachers trained in supervision give short 1-week courses before classes begin<br>Other periodic courses given | Professional teachers<br>Students on secondary level<br>University students in educational studies<br>Volunteer teachers |
| Tanzania | Institute of Adult Education trains teachers, administrators, and researchers plus a 1-week literacy session<br>Head teachers give 3-week seminars for non-teacher volunteers | Public school teachers<br>Volunteers<br>Civil servants, students,<br>College instructors |

TABLE VI-D

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | Teacher Trainers | Teachers |
|---|---|---|
| Ecuador | Responsibility of National Coordinator<br>(Many inadequately trained due to high teacher turn over | Primary school teachers<br>Agricultural extension personnel workers |
| China | Normal schools<br>Professional teachers trained the little teachers and volunteer or mass teachers<br>(2,000,000 trained in the ten-year period) | Professional teachers<br>Volunteer teachers<br>Little or peer teachers<br>Literate workers<br>Government representatives |
| India | District personnel were responsible<br>(Rapid expansion of the project caused frequent diluting in the quality of training) | Primary teachers<br>Knowledgeable agricultural personnel |
| Cuba | One-week training given by teachers, doctors in pedagogy, and researchers | Students 13 years and older with 6th grade education or above<br>Professional teachers<br>Literate factory workers<br>(a quarter million in all) |
| Venezuela | ACUDE<br>and<br>community leaders | "Facilitators" with help of records, primers, the press, movies, radio and TV |

**TABLE VI-E**

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | Supervisors | Producers of Materials |
|---|---|---|
| Russia | Commissariat of Education and its committees<br>Local committees | Department of National Minorities with help of teachers<br>Well-known authors wrote primers<br>Extraordinary Commission for the Struggle Against Illiteracy |
| Brazil | Teachers visited classes occasionally and interviewed instructors<br>Overall supervision- Executive Secretary of MOBRAL and assistant coordinators at state, area, and local levels | Training materials- MOBRAL<br>Private publishers collaborating with MOBRAL |
| Nicaragua | Teachers and university-level education students | Teachers and university-level students in educational studies |
| Guatemala | Certified teachers<br>(in rural areas there was hardly any supervision) | National Indigenous Institute<br>Office of Integral Plan of Education<br>Summer Institute of Linguistics<br>Editors of the Ministry of Education |
| Tanzania | 556 specially trained supervisors | Writers' workshops given to produce primers<br>UNDP/UNESCO helped develop various interest primers |

**TABLE VI-F**

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ecuador | School supervisors<br>Director of Education in each province | UNESCO trained a number of people in the production and testing of materials<br>Specialists in agriculture, industry, handicrafts, etc. with help of literacy experts |
| China | Professional teachers | Some by students themselves<br>Mass Reading Materials Society<br>The Central Administration |
| India | Personnel from Administrative level<br>6 part-time or 2 full-time supervisors per district under the District Education Officer | National Directorate of Adult Education<br>Workshops and seminars of literacy writers at national and regional levels with assistance from a UNESCO specialist |
| Cuba | Professional teacher-counsellors as unit leaders of groups of 25 teachers in one area | National Coordination Committee |
| Venezuela | Community leaders | ACUDE, both primers and follow-up materials |
| | Supervisors | Producers of Materials |

TABLE VI-G

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | Evaluation | Organizational Promotors |
|---|---|---|
| Russia | Commission on Education and its committees<br>Trade Unions and other organizational control<br>Curriculum control in the later stages | Trade Unions<br>Youth Organizations<br>Collective Farms<br>Factories<br>Businesses<br>Churches<br>Clubs |
| Brazil | The teachers have complete autonomy to declare a student literate on the basis of standardized guidelines | Public and private businesses<br>Municipalities |
| Nicaragua | Teachers and volunteer teachers do the evaluating | Popular Sandanista Army<br>Workers' Confederations<br>Youth Leagues<br>Students' Associations<br>Women's groups<br>Religious groups<br>Ministries of the government<br>Teachers' Organizations<br>Two universities |
| Guatemala | Evaluating done by trained personnel | Private businesses<br>Social Welfare Office<br>Universities<br>Amigos<br>Reconstruction Committee<br>Religious organizations<br>Peace Corps<br>Army<br>Sindicates |
| Tanzania | Evaluating done by special teams organized by the government.<br>Teams made up of representatives from government, universities, the army, and churches | UNDP/UNESCO<br>Army<br>Unions<br>Libraries<br>Broadcasters<br>Newspaper personnel |

## TABLE VI-H

Personnel Involved in Campaigns

| | Evaluation | Organizational Promotors |
|---|---|---|
| Ecuador | National level technicians with UNESCO guidelines made a written test | UNDP/UNESCO<br>Misión Andina<br>Summer Institute of Linguistics<br>Salisiana-Oriente Misión |
| China | Teachers and instructors | Trade Unions<br>Factories<br>Enterprises<br>Youth Corps<br>Women's Associations<br>Government representatives at county level |
| India | UNDP personnel did field evaluation<br>(comprehensive evaluation impossible) | UNDP/UNESCO |
| Cuba | Pre-tests, mid-term tests, and post tests given by the instructors | All existing mass and revolutionary organizations |
| Venezuela | Planned by 4 of IU staff in School of Education directed by Dr. Michael Chiappetta, chairperson of the Department of History, Philosophy, and Comparative Studies of Education possibly in 1983 | Service organizations<br>Banks<br>Supermarkets<br>Cattle Producers Associations |

## TABLE VII-A

Level of Literacy Reached During Campaign

| | |
|---|---|
| Russia[1] | The exam for a certificate included the following:<br>-Read aloud a short passage<br>-Explain its contents<br>-Answer questions about it<br>-Understand common terms<br>-Use elementary spelling rules<br>-Write short sentences without help<br>-Add and subtract six-digit numbers<br>-Multiply and divide whole numbers<br>-Have an idea of fractions and percentages<br>-Have mastered metric measures and time |
| Brazil[2] | To be declared literate, one had to:<br>-Identify content of texts and sentences one reads<br>-Write sentences and phrases that make good sense<br>-Solve problems that involve four math operations with one or two digits with or without grouping<br>-Solve problems involving measurements of length, weight, volume, and time, calculations of perimeters, using whole numbers and fractions. |
| Nicaragua[3] | To be declared literate, one had to:<br>-Write his/her name<br>-Read a paragraph containing vocabulary from the more advanced lessons (3rd or 4th grade primary texts)<br>-Answer questions about the paragraph<br>-Take dictation<br>-Write a brief essay on one of three themes |
| Guatemala[4] | To be declared literate, one had to:<br>-Have satisfactory domination of Spanish; speak, read, write, and hear<br>-Have functional handling of math; four basic operations<br>-Understand units of measure and their uses, areas, simple geometric figures, percentages<br>-Appreciate national cultural values |

## TABLE VII-B

Level of Literacy Reached During Campaign

| | |
|---|---|
| Tanzania[5] | Literacy graduates completed Level IV of the following:<br>Level I - Those who were enrolled and attended at least two-thirds of the literacy sessions during any one year of the campaign<br>Level II - Those who are qualified for Level I but who also have successfully passed one or both tests for the following sub-levels:<br>1. able to recognize words and/or symbols and/or arithmetical signs including mental calculations<br>2. able to read a short simple meaningful sentence, to write a short simple sentence, to add and subtract one-digit numbers<br>Level III - Those qualified for Level II but who also have successfully passed one or both of the tests for the following sub-levels:<br>1. able to read a short, simple meaningful sentence, able to add and subtract two-digit numbers<br>2. able to read fluently a simple text, to write a short, simple message, to add and subtract three-digit numbers, multiply two-digit numbers, and divide by one-digit numbers.<br>Level IV - Those who qualified for Level III but who also are able to read and write messages, to read newspapers to keep up with current events, and obtain information, to read instructions, books on better living, better food, etc., to keep records and simple books of accounts of income and expenditures |
| Ecuador[6] | To be declared literate, one had to:<br>Pass a written test that included the 3R's, citizenship and civics, geography, history, and higiene (estimated second-grade level) |

**TABLE VII-C**

Level of Literacy Reached During Campaign

| | |
|---|---|
| China[7] | Anyone was declared literate who could:<br>-Recognize, understand, read, write, explain, and use 1000 commonly-used characters<br>-Who had completed the textbooks edited and published by the central administration |
| India[8] | Anyone was declared literate who:<br>-Had acquisition of literacy skills<br>-Had acquisition of numeracy skills<br>(Functional knowledge of both, equivalent to grade four or five of the primary level) |
| Cuba[9] | Anyone was declared literate who:<br>-Had completed the fifteen-lesson primer<br>-Could read all fifteen lessons<br>(Reading on first-grade level and no writing skills tested) |
| Venezuela[10] | Anyone is declared literate who:<br>-Completes the Curso Basico which is the primer developed by ACUDE estimated to be second-grade level of the 3R's (based on examination of primer) |

**TABLE VIII-A**

Results of the Campaign

| | Illiteracy Rate Change | Other Changes | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Russia[1] | 70% to 12.6% | Consolidation of new political culture<br>Politicization of masses<br>Resocialization of society<br>Produced better farmers and better workers | Continued adult literacy classes after campaign brought literacy rate up to 98.1% by 1959 and 99.7% by 1980. |
| Brazil[2] | 33.6% to 10% | Better job opportunities<br>Better health services<br>Culturization<br>Community development projects carried out<br>Greater pool of skills | MOBRAL does not encourage outside evaluation<br>Literacy rates and enrollment figures are doubted as reported<br>Data may be discounted but success is still evident |
| Nicaragua[3] | 50.2% to 15% | Social justice<br>Modernization<br>Higher productivity<br>New attitude toward women<br>Transformation of values and behaviors in young teachers | Opposition to new ideology, for many equated it with atheistic communism<br>Very low level of literacy achieved - basic decoding and encoding of written messages |
| Guatemala[4] | 53% no significant change | The thing that changed most was the deterioration of the political situation.<br>Statistical results are not available | Spanish phases and some of the indigenous language programs were begun, but all were phased out because of high drop-out rates due to the political situation |
| Tanzania[5] | 67% to 5-10% | Individual changes in thinking, feeling, and envisioning<br>Loss of alienation, fear and marginality<br>Self-confidence, assertiveness<br>Politicization of masses | Created awareness of need for compulsory school attendance for children.<br>By 1979, 93% of eligible children were in school.<br>The 5-10% figure (Col.I) was the expected rate for 1981. |

TABLE VIII-B

Results of the Campaign

| | Illiteracy Rate Change | Other Changes | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ecuador[6] | 32% to 28% | Improved level of living<br>Students more autonomously sought solutions to their learning problems | Due to insufficient funding, campaign did not reach its goals.<br>Not enough integration of literacy training and vocational components being taught |
| China[7] | 85% to 65% | Political socialization<br>Economic development<br>Abolition of class structures<br>Innovation in social roles<br>School enrollment up at all levels | 90,000,000 enrolled in anti-illiteracy and spare time schools.<br>100,000,000 became literate from 1949 to 1959.<br>Illiteracy rate down to 35% by 1979. |
| India[8] | Not given | Acquisition of literacy and numeracy skills<br>Attitudinal change<br>Improvement in knowledge and utilization of newly learned agricultural skills<br>Higher standard of living | Sufficiently favorable results to recommend continuation of the project in other areas |
| Cuba[9] | 23.6% to 3.9% | Consciousness raising<br>Politicization<br>Breakdown of class structures<br>Awakening of thirst for own culture | Many programs are continuing in adult education. |
| Venezuela[10] | | The campaign suffered very serious operational difficulties.<br>The administrative framework had to be changed. | All top level personnel had to be replaced.<br>Evaluation was postponed for a year and a half.<br>Apparently campaign is still in progress but weakened. |

TABLE IX

Analysis of data based on the four levels of success established for the study. "Yes" signifies success at that level, "No" signifies not successful.

| | Level I | Level II | Level III | Level IV |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Russia | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Brazil | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Nicaragua | yes | no | yes | yes |
| Guatemala | yes | yes | no | no |
| Tanzania | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Ecuador | yes | no | no | no |
| China | yes | no | yes | yes |
| India | yes | yes | yes | no |
| Cuba | yes | no | yes | yes |
| Venezuela | (No results available) | | | |

TABLE X

Tabular analysis of data in regard to Hypothesis II

("X" signifies success on that point)

| | a | b | c | d | e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Russia | X | X | X | X | X |
| Brazil | X | X | X | X | X |
| Nicaragua | X | X | X | | X |
| Guatemala | X | | X | X | |
| Tanzania | X | X | X | X | X |
| Ecuador | X | | | | |
| China | X | X | X | | X |
| India | X | | | X | |
| Cuba | X | X | X | | X |
| Venezuela | (Results not available) | | | | |

## Notes for Tables

### TABLE I

[1] H. S. Bhola, Campaigning for Literacy (Paris: UNESCO, 1982), pp. 57-58.

[2] Bhola, p. 184.

[3] Brazilian Literacy Movement

[4] Philip G. Altbach, Robert F. Arnove, and Gail P. Kelly, Comparative Education (New York: Macmillan, 1982), pp. 433-434.

[5] Estudio de la Situación en Cuanto a la Alfabetización en America Latina: Informe (Mexico: CREFAL Publications, 1968), p. 16.

[6] Bhola, p. 213.

[7] The Experimental World Literacy Programme: A Critical Assessment (Paris: UNESCO Press, 1976), p. 26.

[8] Experimental World Literacy Programme, a cooperative effort to experiment with functional literacy pilot projects bu UNDP, United Nations Development Program, and UNESCO with eleven developing countries.

[9] Bhola, pp. 111-112.

[10] EWLP (same as No. 7), pp. 9, 48.

[11] Bhola, p. 134.

[12] Asociación Cultural Para el Desarrollo: ACUDE (New York: Simón Bolivar Foundation, Inc., (1980?), p. 1.

**TABLE II**

[1] Bhola, pp. 58-75.

[2] Bhola, pp. 184-200.

[3] Altbach, pp. 433-447.

[4] Edgardo A. Castañeda, "International Cooperation in Education: The Guatemala Experience," Reports and Studies (Paris: UNESCO Press, 1979), pp. 2-4.

[5] Bhola, pp. 213-220.

[6] EWLP, p. 27.

[7] Bhola, pp. 108-112.

[8] EWLP, pp. 48-54.

[9] Bhola, pp. 134-144.

[10] Asociación, p. 1 and "Intervención del José Alvarez Stelling Presidente de la Asociación Cultural Para el Desarrollo (ACUDE), Venezuela, en al Acto de Presentación ante el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo de la Campaña Libertadora de Alfabetización de Venezuela," (Washington, D.C.: September 14, 1981), p. 1 and ACUDE: Una Proyección Hacia el Desarrollo Humano (Caracas: Cromotip Press, 1980), p. 4.

## TABLE III

[1] Bhola, pp. 56-57.

[2] Bhola, p. 187.

[3] Altbach, p. 433.

[4] John R. Hansen, et al., Guatemala: Economic and Social Position and Prospects (Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1978), p. 20.

[5] Bhola, pp. 214.

[6] EWLP, pp. 27-28 and Estudio, p. 108 and Area Handbook for Ecuador (Washington, D.C.: US Printing Office, 1973), p. 121 and Alexander G. Nowicki, et al., Ecuador: Development Problems and Prospects (Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1979), p. 1.

[7] Bhola, p. 108.

[8] EWLP, pp. 48-49.

[9] Bhola, pp. 135, 144.

[10] Asociación, p. 4 and Intervención, p. 1 and ACUDE, p. 3.

## TABLE IV

[1] Bhola, p. 55.

[2] Bhola, p 184.

[3] Altbach, pp. 433-435, 444-446.

[4] Experience of writer

[5] Bhola, p. 213.

[6] EWLP, p. 27. Also Area, pp. 121-122.

[7] Bhola, p. 108.

[8] EWLP, pp. 48, 54.

[9] Bhola, pp. 134-135.

[10] Asociación, p. 1 and personal conversation with Dr. Michael Chiappetta.

**TABLE V**

[1] Bhola, pp. 66-75.

[2] Bhola, pp. 198-206.

[3] Altbach, p. 435.

[4] Estudio, pp. 116-120.

[5] Bhola, p. 231.

[6] EWLP, pp. 28-29.

[7] Bhola, pp. 111-123.

[8] EWLP, pp. 52-53.

[9] Bhola, pp. 134-146.

[10] Asociación, p. 5.

[11] ACUDE organization (funds from individuals and other private organizations)

[12] Bhola, p. 198.

TABLE VI

[1] Bhola, pp. 58-81.

[2] Bhola, pp. 190-206.

[3] Altbach, pp. 434-437.

[4] Estudio, pp. 116-120,

[5] Hansen, p. 68.

[6] Dirección de Alfabetización y Educación de Adultos

[7] Bhola, pp. 213-242.

[8] EWLP, pp. 28-29. Estudio, pp. 108, 110-111.

[9] Bhola, pp. 108-130.

[10] EWLP, pp. 43-54.

[11] Bhola, pp. 134-157.

[12] ACUDE, pp. 1, 3-6, Intervención, p. 3, and Michael Chiappetta, "A Proposal for Evaluation of the National Literacy Campaign in Venezuela (ACUDE) School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, p. 4.

TABLE VII

[1] Bhola, p. 75.

[2] Bhola, p. 202.

[3] Altbach, pp. 442, 449.

[4] Estudio, p. 120, and Inventario de Alfabetización y Educación de Adultos en America Latina y el Caribe: Guatemala (Mexico: CREFAL Publications, 1979), p. 30.

[5] Bhola, p 235.

[6] Estudio, p. 111. Estimate based on description and knowledge of other primers.

[7] Bhola, p. 127.

[8] EWLP, pp. 51-52, 54.

[9] Bhola, pp. 150-152.

[10] Estimate determined after examination of primer used, Sono-Estudio, Curso Basico (Caracas: Grabaciones Nacionales, 1980).

**TABLE VIII**

[1] Bhola, pp. 77-79.

[2] Bhola, pp. 184, 208-209, 197-198.

[3] Altbach, pp. 433, 442-443.

[4] Sauder, "Human Resource Development as a Strategy for Modernization in Guatemala: Adult Literacy Emphasis," an unpublished paper. (August, 1982), p. 12.

[5] Bhola, pp. 214, 241-242.

[6] Area, p. 121, and EWLP, pp. 31-32.

[7] Bhola, pp. 128, 130, and Altbach, p. 415.

[8] EWLP, p. 54.

[9] Altbach, p. 433. Bhola, pp. 135-136.

[10] Personal conversation with Michael Chiappetta quoting The Simón Bolivar Foundation in New York.

Bibliography

ACUDE: Una Proyección Hacia el Desarrollo Humano. Caracas: Cromotip Press, 1980.

Altbach, Philip G., Arnove, Robert F., and Kelly, Gail P. Comparative Education. New York: Macmillan, 1982.

Area Handbook for Brazil. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Area Handbook for Cuba. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Area Handbook for Ecuador. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Area Handbook for the Soviet Union. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Asociación Cultural Para el Desarrollo: ACUDE. New York: Simón Bolivar Foundation, Inc., 1980?

Brazil: Integrated Development of the Northwest Frontier. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1981.

Bhola, H. S. Campaigning for Literacy. Paris: UNESCO, 1982.

Castañeda, Edgardo A. "International Cooperation in Education." Report Studies. from Division of Educational Policy and Planning. Paris: UNESCO Press, 1979.

Chiappetta, Michael. A Proposal for Evaluation of the National Literacy Campaign in Venezuela (ACUDE). Bloomington: School of Education, Indiana University, 1981.

China Yearbook, 1980. Taipei, Taiwan: China Publishing Company, 1980.

Estimates and Projections of Illiteracy. UNESCO Division on Statistics on Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Statistics, 1978.

Estudio de la Situación en Cuanto a la Alfabetización en America Latina: Informe. Mexico: CREFAL Publications, 1968.

The Experimental World Literacy Programme: A Critical Assessment. Paris: UNESCO Press, 1976.

Hansen, John R. et al. Guatemala: Economic and Social Position and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1978.

India: A Reference Annual, 1980. Faridabad: Government of India Press, 1980.

Intervención del Dr. José Alvarez Stelling. Presidente de la Asociación Cultural para el Desarrollo (ACUDE), Venezuela, en el Acto de Presentación ante el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo de la Campaña Libertadora de Alfabetización de Venezuela. Washington, D.C.: (September 14, 1981).

Inventario de Alfabetización y Educación de Adultos en America Latina y el Caribe: Guatemala. Patzcuaro, Michoacán, Mexico: CREFAL, 1979.

Inventario de Alfabetización y Educación de Adultos en America Latina y el Caribe: Venezuela. Patzcuaro, Michoacán, Mexico: CREFAL, 1979.

Literacy 1972-1976: Progress Achieved in Literacy Throughout the World. Paris: Union Typographique, 1980.

Nowicki, Alexandre G. et al. Ecuador Development Problems and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, (July, 1979).

Venkataiah, N. Impact of Farmers' Functional Literacy Programme on the Participants in Andhra Pradesh. Tirupat, India: S. V. University Press, 1978.

Addendum

Kaplan, Irving, ed. Area Handbook Series: Tanzania, A Country Study. Washington, D.C.: The American University Press, 1978.